

# Lower estimates of random unconditional constants of Walsh-Paley martingales with values in Banach spaces

Stefan Geiss \*

Mathematisches Institut der Friedrich Schiller Universität Jena  
UHH 17.0G, D O-6900 Jena, Germany

February 8, 2008

**Abstract.** For a Banach space  $X$  we define  $RUMD_n(X)$  to be the infimum of all  $c > 0$  such that

$$\left( AV_{\varepsilon_k=\pm 1} \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k (M_k - M_{k-1}) \right\|_{L_2^X}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq c \|M_n\|_{L_2^X}$$

holds for all Walsh-Paley martingales  $\{M_k\}_0^n \subset L_2^X$  with  $M_0 = 0$ . We relate the asymptotic behaviour of the sequence  $\{RUMD_n(X)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  to geometrical properties of the Banach space  $X$  such as K-convexity and superreflexivity.

1980 Mathematics Subject Classification (1985 Revision): 46B10, 46B20

## 0 Introduction

A Banach space  $X$  is said to be an UMD-space if for all  $1 < p < \infty$  there is a constant  $c_p = c_p(X) > 0$  such that

$$\sup_{\varepsilon_k=\pm 1} \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k (M_k - M_{k-1}) \right\|_{L_p^X} \leq c_p \left\| \sum_1^n (M_k - M_{k-1}) \right\|_{L_p^X}$$

for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and all martingales  $\{M_k\}_0^n \subset L_p^X$  with values in  $X$ . It turns out that this definition is equivalent to the modified one if we replace "for all  $1 < p < \infty$ " by "for some  $1 < p < \infty$ ", and "for all martingales" by "for all Walsh-Paley-martingales" (see [3] for a survey). Motivated by these definitions we investigate Banach spaces  $X$  by means of the sequences  $\{RUMD_n(X)\}_{n=1}^\infty$  whereas  $RUMD_n(X) := \inf c$  such that

$$\left( AV_{\varepsilon_k=\pm 1} \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k (M_k - M_{k-1}) \right\|_{L_2^X}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq c \|M_n\|_{L_2^X}$$

holds for all Walsh-Paley martingales  $\{M_k\}_0^n \subset L_2^X$  with the starting point  $M_0 = 0$ . "RUMD" stands for "random unconditional constants of martingale differences". We consider "random" unconditional constants instead of the usual one, where  $\sup_{\varepsilon=\pm 1}$  is taken in place of  $AV_{\varepsilon=\pm 1}$ , since they naturally appear in the lower estimates we are interested in. These lower estimates are of course lower estimates

---

\*The author is supported by the DFG (Ko 962/3-1).

for the non-random case, too. The paper is organized in the following way. Using a technique of Maurey we show that the exponent 2 in the definition of  $RUMD_n(X)$  can be replaced by any  $1 < p < \infty$  (see Theorem 2.4). Then we observe (see Theorem 3.5)

$$X \text{ is not K-convex} \iff RUMD_n(x) \asymp n.$$

In the case of superreflexive Banach spaces this turns into

$$X \text{ is not superreflexive} \implies RUMD_n(X) \succeq n^{1/2},$$

and, under the assumption  $X$  is of type 2,

$$X \text{ is not superreflexive} \iff RUMD_n(x) \asymp n^{1/2}$$

(see Theorems 4.3 and 4.4). Using an example due to Bourgain we see that the type 2 condition is necessary. In fact, for all  $1 < p < 2 \leq q < \infty$  there is a superreflexive Banach space  $X$  of type  $p$  and cotype  $q$  such that  $RUMD_n(X) \asymp n^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}}$  (see Corollary 5.4). According to a result of James a non-superreflexive Banach spaces  $X$  is characterized by the existence of large "James-trees" in the unit ball  $B_X$  of  $X$ . We can identify these trees with Walsh-Paley martingales  $\{M_k\}_0^n$  which only take values in the unit ball  $B_X$  and which satisfy  $\inf_{\omega} \|M_k(\omega) - M_{k-1}(\omega)\| \geq \theta$  for some fixed  $0 < \theta < 1$ . In this way we can additionally show that the martingales, which give the lower estimates of our random unconditional constants, are even James trees (see Theorems 3.5(2) and 4.3).

## 1 Preliminaries

The standard notation of the Banach space theory is used (cf.[10]). Throughout this paper  $\mathbb{K}$  stands for the real or complex scalars.  $B_X$  is the closed unit ball of the Banach space  $X$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  is the space of all linear and continuous operators from a Banach space  $X$  into a Banach space  $Y$  equipped with the usual operator norm. We consider martingales over the probability space  $[\Omega_n, \mu_n]$  which is given by  $\Omega_n := \{\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$  and  $\mu_n(\omega) := \frac{1}{2^n}$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega_n$ . The minimal  $\sigma$ -algebras  $\mathcal{F}_k$ , such that the coordinate functionals  $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) \rightarrow \omega_i \in \mathbb{K}$  are measurable for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_0 := \{\emptyset, \Omega_n\}$  form a natural filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}$  on  $\Omega_n$ . A martingale  $\{M_k\}_0^n$  with values in a Banach space  $X$  over  $[\Omega_n, \mu_n]$  with respect to this filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_k\}_0^n$  is called Walsh-Paley martingale. As usual we put  $dM_0 := M_0, dM_k := M_k - M_{k-1}$  for  $k \geq 1$  and  $M_k^*(\omega) = \sup_{0 \leq l \leq k} \|M_l(\omega)\|$ . Given a function  $M \in L_p^X(\Omega_n)$  we can set  $M_k := \mathbb{E}(M | \mathcal{F}_k)$  for  $k = 0, \dots, n$ . Consequently, for each  $M \in L_p^X(\Omega_n)$  there is a unique Walsh-Paley martingale  $\{M_k\}_0^n$  with  $M_n = M$ . In this paper we consider a further probability space  $[ID_n, P_n]$  with  $ID_n = \{\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n) \in \{-1, 1\}^n\}$  and  $P_n(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2^n}$  for all  $\varepsilon \in ID_n$ .  $\mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon, \omega}$  means that we take the expectation with respect to the product measure  $P_n \times \mu_n$ . To estimate the random unconditional constants of Walsh-Paley martingales from above we use the notion of the type. For  $1 \leq p \leq 2$  an operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  is of type  $p$  if

$$\left( \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} \left\| \sum_k T \varepsilon_k x_k \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq c \left( \sum_k \|x_k\|^p \right)^{1/p}$$

for some constant  $c > 0$  and all finite sequences  $\{x_k\} \subset X$ . The infimum of all possible constants  $c > 0$  is denoted by  $T_p(T)$ . Considering the above inequality for sequences  $\{x_k\}_{k=1}^n \subset X$  of a fixed length  $n$  only we obtain the corresponding constant  $T_p^n(T)$  which can be defined for each operator  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ . In the case  $T = I_X$  is the identity of a Banach space  $X$  we write  $T_p(X)$  and  $T_p^n(X)$  instead of  $T_p(I_X)$  and  $T_p^n(I_X)$ , and say " $X$  is of type  $p$ " in place of " $I_X$  is of type  $p$ " (see [17] for more information).

## 2 Basic definition

Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  and  $1 \leq q < \infty$ . Then  $RUMD_n^q(T) = \inf c$ , where the infimum is taken over all  $c > 0$  such that

$$\left( \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon, \omega} \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k T dM_k(\omega) \right\|^q \right)^{1/q} \leq c (\mathbb{E}_\omega \|M_n(\omega)\|^q)^{1/q}$$

holds for all Walsh-Paley martingales  $\{M_k\}_0^n$  with values in  $X$  and  $M_0 = 0$ . Especially, we set  $RUMD_n^q(X) := RUMD_n^q(I_X)$  for a Banach space  $X$  with the identity  $I_X$ . It is clear that  $RUMD_n^q(T) \leq 2n\|T\|$  since

$$\left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k T dM_k \right\|_{L_q^X} \leq \sum_1^n \|T\| \|dM_k\|_{L_q^X} \leq \|T\| \sum_1^n (\|M_k\|_{L_q^X} + \|M_{k-1}\|_{L_q^X}) \leq 2n\|T\| \|M_n\|_{L_q^X}.$$

In the case  $X$  is an UMD-space we have  $\sup_n RUMD_n^q(X) < \infty$  whenever  $1 < q < \infty$  (the converse seems to be open).  $q = 1$  yields a "singularity" since  $RUMD_n^1(X) \asymp RUMD_n^1(\mathbb{K}) \asymp n$  for any Banach space  $X$  (see Corollary 5.2) therefore we restrict our consideration on  $1 < q < \infty$ . Here we show that the quantities  $RUMD_n^q(T)$  are equivalent for  $1 < q < \infty$ . In [5](Thm.4.1) it is stated that  $\sup_n RUMD_n^q(X) < \infty$  iff  $\sup_n RUMD_n^r(X) < \infty$  for all  $1 < q, r < \infty$ . Using Lemma 2.2, which slightly extends [11](Thm.II.1), we prove a more precise result in Theorem 2.4.

Let us start with a general martingale transform. Assuming  $T_1, \dots, T_n \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  we define

$$\phi = \phi(T_1, \dots, T_n) : L_0^X(\Omega_n) \longrightarrow L_0^Y(\Omega_n) \quad \text{by} \quad \phi(M)(\omega) := \sum_1^n T_k dM_k(\omega),$$

where  $M_k = \mathbb{E}(M | \mathcal{F}_k)$ . The following duality is standard.

**Lemma 2.1** *Let  $1 < p < \infty$ ,  $T_1, \dots, T_n \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  and  $\phi = \phi(T_1, \dots, T_n) : L_p^X \longrightarrow L_p^Y$ . Then*

$$\phi'(F) = \sum_1^n T_k' dF_k \quad \text{for all } F \in L_{p'}^{Y'}.$$

*Proof.* Using the known formula

$$\langle M, M' \rangle = \sum_0^n \langle dM_k, dM'_k \rangle \quad \left( M \in L_s^Z(\Omega_n), M' \in L_{s'}^{Z'}(\Omega_n), 1 < s < \infty \right),$$

for  $M \in L_p^X(\Omega_n)$  and  $F \in L_{p'}^{Y'}(\Omega_n)$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle M, \phi' F \rangle &= \left\langle \sum_1^n T_k dM_k, F \right\rangle = \sum_1^n \langle T_k dM_k, dF_k \rangle \\ &= \sum_1^n \langle dM_k, T_k' dF_k \rangle = \left\langle M, \sum_1^n T_k' dF_k \right\rangle. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Now we recall [11](Thm.II.1) in a more general form. Although the proof is the same we repeat some of the details for the convenience of the reader.

**Lemma 2.2** *Let  $1 < p < r < \infty$ ,  $T_1, \dots, T_n \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$  and  $\phi = \phi(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ . Then*

$$\|\phi : L_p^X \rightarrow L_p^Y\| \leq \frac{6r^2}{(p-1)(r-1)} \|\phi : L_r^X \rightarrow L_r^Y\|.$$

*Proof.* We define  $1 < q < \infty$  and  $0 < \alpha < 1$  with  $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{q}$  and  $\frac{p}{r} = 1 - \alpha$  and obtain  $\alpha q = (1 - \alpha)r = p$ . Let  $\{M_k\}_0^n$  be a Walsh-Paley martingale in  $X$  with  $dM_1 \neq 0$ . We set

$$^*M_k(\omega) := M_{k-1}^*(\omega) + \sup_{0 \leq l \leq k} \|dM_l(\omega)\| \quad \text{for} \quad k \geq 1$$

and obtain an  $\mathcal{F}_{k-1}^\omega$ -measurable random variable with

$$0 < ^*M_1(\omega) \leq \dots \leq ^*M_n(\omega) \quad \text{and} \quad M_k^*(\omega) \leq ^*M_k(\omega) \leq 3M_k^*(\omega).$$

Using [11](L.II.B) and Doob's inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi(M)\|_p &= \left( \mathbb{E}_\omega \left\| \sum_1^n \frac{T_k dM_k(\omega)}{^*M_k^\alpha(\omega)} ^*M_k^\alpha(\omega) \right\|^p \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq 2 \left( \mathbb{E}_\omega \sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left\| \sum_1^k \frac{T_l dM_l(\omega)}{^*M_l^\alpha(\omega)} \right\|^p ^*M_n^{\alpha p}(\omega) \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq 2 \left( \mathbb{E}_\omega \sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \left\| \sum_1^k \frac{T_l dM_l(\omega)}{^*M_l^\alpha(\omega)} \right\|^r \right)^{1/r} (\mathbb{E}_\omega ^*M_n^{\alpha q}(\omega))^{1/q} \\ &\leq \frac{2r}{r-1} \left( \mathbb{E}_\omega \left\| \sum_1^n \frac{T_k dM_k(\omega)}{^*M_k^\alpha(\omega)} \right\|^r \right)^{1/r} (\mathbb{E}_\omega ^*M_n^p(\omega))^{1/q} \\ &\leq \frac{2r}{r-1} \|\phi\|_r \left( \mathbb{E}_\omega \left\| \sum_1^n \frac{dM_k(\omega)}{^*M_k^\alpha(\omega)} \right\|^r \right)^{1/r} (\mathbb{E}_\omega ^*M_n^p(\omega))^{1/q}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying [11](L.II.A) in the situation  $\|\sum_1^l dM_i(\omega)\| \leq (^*M_l(\omega)^\alpha)^{1/\alpha}$  yields

$$\left\| \sum_1^k \frac{dM_l(\omega)}{^*M_l^\alpha(\omega)} \right\| \leq \frac{1/\alpha}{1/\alpha - 1} ^*M_k(\omega)^{\alpha(1/\alpha - 1)} \leq \frac{r}{p} ^*M_n(\omega)^{p/r}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi(M)\|_p &\leq \frac{2r^2}{(r-1)p} \|\phi\|_r (\mathbb{E}_\omega ^*M_n(\omega)^p)^{1/p} \leq \frac{6r^2}{(r-1)p} \|\phi\|_r (\mathbb{E}_\omega M_n^*(\omega)^p)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \frac{6r^2}{(r-1)(p-1)} \|\phi\|_r \|M_n\|_p. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We deduce

**Lemma 2.3** *Let  $T_1, \dots, T_n : X \rightarrow L_1^Y(ID_n)$  and  $\phi := \phi(T_1, \dots, T_n)$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, n$  assume that  $T_i(X) \subseteq \{f : f = \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k y_k, y_k \in Y\}$ . Then*

$$\frac{1}{c_{pr}} \|\phi : L_p^X \rightarrow L_p^{L_p^Y}\| \leq \|\phi : L_r^X \rightarrow L_r^{L_r^Y}\| \leq c_{pr} \|\phi : L_p^X \rightarrow L_p^{L_p^Y}\|$$

for  $1 < p < r < \infty$ , where the constant  $c_{pr} > 0$  is independent from  $X, Y, (T_1, \dots, T_n)$  and  $n$ .

*Proof.* The left-hand inequality follows from Lemma 2.2 and

$$\|\phi : L_p^X \rightarrow L_p^{L_p^Y}\| \leq \frac{6r^2}{(p-1)(r-1)} \|\phi : L_r^X \rightarrow L_r^{L_r^Y}\| \leq \frac{6r^2}{(p-1)(r-1)} \|\phi : L_r^X \rightarrow L_r^{L_r^Y}\|.$$

The right-hand inequality is a consequence of Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi : L_r^X \rightarrow L_r^{L_r^Y}\| &= \|\phi' : L_{r'}^{L_{r'}^{Y'}} \rightarrow L_{r'}^{X'}\| \\ &\leq \frac{6r'^2}{(p'-1)(r'-1)} \|\phi' : L_{p'}^{L_{p'}^{Y'}} \rightarrow L_{p'}^{X'}\| \\ &= \frac{6r'^2}{(p'-1)(r'-1)} \|\phi : L_p^X \rightarrow L_p^{L_p^Y}\| \\ &\leq \frac{6r'^2}{(p'-1)(r'-1)} K_{rp} \|\phi : L_p^X \rightarrow L_p^{L_p^Y}\|, \end{aligned}$$

where we use Kahane's inequality (cf. [10] (II.1.e.13)) in the last step.  $\square$

If we apply Lemma 2.3 in the situation  $T_k x := \varepsilon_k T x$  and exploit

$$RUMD_n^p(T) \leq \|\phi(T_1, \dots, T_n) : L_p^X \rightarrow L_p^{L_p^Y}\| \leq 2RUMD_n^p(T)$$

then we arrive at

**Theorem 2.4** *Let  $1 < p < r < \infty$  and  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ . Then*

$$\frac{1}{c_{pr}} RUMD_n^p(T) \leq RUMD_n^r(T) \leq c_{pr} RUMD_n^p(T),$$

where the constant  $c_{pr} > 0$  is independent from  $X, Y, T$  and  $n$ .

The above consideration justifies

$$RUMD_n(T) := RUMD_n^2(T) \quad \text{for } T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$$

and  $RUMD_n(X) := RUMD_n(I_X)$  for a Banach space  $X$ .

### 3 K-convexity

We show that  $RUMD_n(X) \asymp n$  if and only if  $X$  is not K-convex, that is, if and only if  $X$  uniformly contains  $l_1^n$ . To do this some additional notation is required. For  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in X$  we set

$$|x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_n|_X := \sup\{|det(\langle x_i, a_j \rangle)_{i,j=1}^n| : a_1, \dots, a_n \in B_{X'}\}.$$

Furthermore, for fixed  $n$  we define the bijection

$$i : \{-1, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{1, \dots, 2^n\}$$

as

$$i(\omega) = i(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) := 1 + \frac{1 - \omega_n}{2} + \frac{1 - \omega_{n-1}}{2}2 + \dots + \frac{1 - \omega_1}{2}2^{n-1}$$

and the corresponding sets  $I_0 := \{1, \dots, 2^n\}$ ,  $I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) := \{i(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n)\}$ ,

$$I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k) := \{i(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) : \omega_{k+1} = \pm 1, \dots, \omega_n = \pm 1\} \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

It is clear that

$$I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}) = I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, 1) \cup I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, -1) \quad \text{and} \quad I_0 = I(1) \cup I(-1).$$

Our first lemma is technical.

**Lemma 3.1** *Let  $\{M_k\}_0^n$  be a Walsh-Paley-martingale in  $X$  and let  $x_k := M_n(i^{-1}(k)) \in X$  for  $k = 1, \dots, 2^n$ . Then, for all  $\omega \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  and  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , there exist natural numbers  $1 \leq r_0 \leq s_0 < r_1 \leq s_1 < \dots < r_k \leq s_k \leq 2^n$  with*

$$|M_0(\omega) \wedge \dots \wedge M_k(\omega)| = \frac{1}{2^k} \left| \frac{x_{r_0} + \dots + x_{s_0}}{s_0 - r_0 + 1} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{x_{r_k} + \dots + x_{s_k}}{s_k - r_k + 1} \right|$$

*Proof.* Let us fix  $\omega \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ . Since  $M_l(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_l) = \frac{1}{2^{n-l}} \sum_{i \in I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_l)} x_i$  we have for  $l = 0, \dots, n-1$ ,

$$M_l(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_l) - \frac{1}{2} M_{l+1}(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{l+1}) = \frac{1}{2^{n-l}} \sum_{I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_l, -\omega_{l+1})} x_i = \frac{1}{2 \# I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_l, -\omega_{l+1})} \sum_{I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_l, -\omega_{l+1})} x_i$$

for  $l = 0, \dots, n-1$ . It is clear that  $I(-\omega_1), I(\omega_1, -\omega_2), I(\omega_1, \omega_2, -\omega_3), \dots, I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, -\omega_k), I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k)$  are disjoint, such that we have

$$\begin{aligned} |M_0(\omega) \wedge \dots \wedge M_k(\omega)| &= \left| \left( M_0(\omega) - \frac{1}{2} M_1(\omega) \right) \wedge \dots \wedge \left( M_{k-1}(\omega) - \frac{1}{2} M_k(\omega) \right) \wedge M_k(\omega) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{2^k} \left| \frac{x_{r_0} + \dots + x_{s_0}}{s_0 - r_0 + 1} \wedge \dots \wedge \frac{x_{r_k} + \dots + x_{s_k}}{s_k - r_k + 1} \right| \end{aligned}$$

after some rearrangement.  $\square$

The second lemma, which is required, is a special case of [6] (Thm.1.1).

**Lemma 3.2** *Let  $u \in \mathcal{L}(l_2^n, X)$  and let  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  be the unit vector basis of  $l_2^n$ . Then*

$$|ue_1 \wedge \dots \wedge ue_n|_X \leq \left(\frac{1}{n!}\right)^{1/2} \pi_2(u)^n,$$

where  $\pi_2(u)$  is the absolutely 2-summing norm of  $u$ .

Now we apply Lemma 3.1 to a special Walsh-Paley-martingale  $\{M_k^1\}_0^n$  with values in  $l_1^{2^n}$  whose differences  $dM_k^1(\omega)$  are closely related to a discret version of the Haar functions from  $L_1[0, 1]$ . For fixed  $n$  this martingale is given by

$$M_n^1(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) := e_{i(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n)} \quad \text{and} \quad M_k^1 := \mathbb{E}(M_n^1 | \mathcal{F}_k),$$

where  $\{e_1, \dots, e_{2^n}\}$  stands for the unit vector basis of  $l_1^{2^n}$ .

**Lemma 3.3** *Let  $n \geq 1$  be fixed. Then*

- (1)  $\|M_k^1(\omega)\| = \|dM_k^1(\omega)\| = 1$  for  $k = 0, \dots, n$  and all  $\omega \in \Omega_n$ ,
- (2)  $\inf_{\omega} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} \|\sum_{k=1}^n \varepsilon_k dM_k^1(\omega)\| \geq \alpha n$  for some  $\alpha > 0$  independent from  $n$ .

*Proof.* (1) is trivial. We consider (2). Lemma 3.1 implies

$$\frac{1}{2^n} |f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n+1}|_{l_1^{n+1}} = |M_0^1(\omega) \wedge \dots \wedge M_n^1(\omega)|_{l_1^{2^n}}$$

for all  $\omega \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ , where  $\{f_1, \dots, f_{n+1}\}$  denotes the unit vector basis of  $l_1^{n+1}$ . We can continue to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} |f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n+1}|_{l_1^{n+1}}^{1/n} &= |M_0^1(\omega) \wedge dM_1^1(\omega) \wedge \dots \wedge dM_n^1(\omega)|_{l_1^{2^n}}^{1/n} \\ &\leq ((n+1) \|M_0^1(\omega)\| \|dM_1^1(\omega) \wedge \dots \wedge dM_n^1(\omega)\|)^{1/n} \\ &\leq c |dM_1^1(\omega) \wedge \dots \wedge dM_n^1(\omega)|^{1/n}. \end{aligned}$$

If we define the operator  $u_{\omega} : l_2^n \rightarrow l_1^{2^n}$  by  $u_{\omega}((\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)) := \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i dM_i^1(\omega)$  and use Lemma 3.2, then we get

$$|dM_1^1(\omega) \wedge \dots \wedge dM_n^1(\omega)|^{1/n} \leq \left(\frac{1}{n!}\right)^{1/2n} \pi_2(u_{\omega}).$$

Since the  $l_1^{2^n}$  are uniformly of cotype 2 there is a constant  $c_1 > 0$ , independent from  $n$ , such that

$$\pi_2(u_{\omega}) \leq c_1 \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \varepsilon_k dM_k^1(\omega) \right\|$$

(see [17], [12]). Summerizing the above estimates yields

$$|f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n+1}|_{l_1^{n+1}}^{1/n} \leq 2ce^{1/2} n^{-1/2} c_1 \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \varepsilon_k dM_k^1(\omega) \right\| \leq c_2 n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n \varepsilon_k dM_k^1(\omega) \right\|.$$

The known estimate  $|f_1 \wedge \dots \wedge f_{n+1}|^{1/n+1} \geq \frac{1}{c_3}(n+1)^{1/2}$  concludes the proof (see, for instance, [6](Ex.2.7)).  $\square$

Finally, we need the trivial

**Lemma 3.4** *Let  $T \in \mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ . Then  $RUMD_n(T) \leq 2n^{1/2}T_2^n(T)$ .*

*Proof.* Using the type 2 inequality for each  $\omega \in \Omega_n$  and integrating yield for a martingale  $\{M_k\}_0^n$

$$\left( \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon, \omega} \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k T dM_k(\omega) \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq T_2^n(T) \left( \sum_1^n \|dM_k\|_{L_2^X}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 2n^{1/2}T_2^n(T) \|M_n\|_{L_2^X}. \square$$

Now we can prove

**Theorem 3.5** *There exists an absolute constant  $\alpha > 0$  such that for any Banach space  $X$  the following assertions are equivalent.*

- (1)  *$X$  is not  $K$ -convex.*
- (2) *For all  $\theta > 0$  and all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  there is a Walsh-Paley martingale  $\{M_k\}_0^n$  with values in  $B_X$ ,*

$$\inf_{1 \leq k \leq n} \inf_{\omega} \|dM_k(\omega)\| \geq 1 - \theta \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{\omega} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k(\omega) \right\| \geq \alpha n.$$

- (3)  *$RUMD_n(X) \geq cn$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and some constant  $c = c(X) > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Taking  $\alpha > 0$  from Lemma 3.3 the implication (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) follows. (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) is trivial. (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1): Assuming  $X$  to be  $K$ -convex the space  $X$  must be of type  $p$  for some  $p > 1$ . Consequently, Lemma 3.4 implies

$$RUMD_n(X) \leq 2n^{1/2}T_2^n(X) \leq 2n^{1/2}n^{1/p-1/2}T_p(X) \leq 2n^{1/p}T_p(X). \square$$

*Remark.* One can also deduce (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) from [4] and [13] in a more direct way (we would obtain that  $L_2^X(\{-1, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}})$  is not  $K$ -convex).

## 4 Superreflexivity

A Banach space  $X$  is superreflexive if each Banach space, which is finitely representable in  $X$ , is reflexive. We will see that  $RUMD_n(X) \geq cn^{1/2}$  whenever  $X$  is not superreflexive and that the exponent  $\frac{1}{2}$  is the best possible in general. This improves an observation of Aldous and Garling (proofs of [5](Thm.3.2) and [1](Prop.2)) which says that  $RUMD_n(X) \geq cn^{1/s}$  in the case  $X$  is of cotype  $s$  ( $2 \leq s < \infty$ ) and not superreflexive.

We make use of the summation operators

$$\sigma_n : l_1^{2^n} \longrightarrow l_{\infty}^{2^n} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma : l_1 \longrightarrow l_{\infty} \quad \text{with} \quad \{\xi_k\}_k \longrightarrow \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^k \xi_l \right\}_k,$$



as well as of

$$\Phi : C[0, 1]' \longrightarrow l_\infty([0, 1]) \quad \text{with} \quad \mu \longrightarrow \{t \rightarrow \mu([0, t])\}.$$

The operators  $\sigma_n$  are an important tool in our situation. Assuming  $X$  to be not superreflexive, according to [7] for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  there are factorizations  $\sigma_n = B_n A_n$  with  $A_n : l_1^{2^n} \rightarrow X$ ,  $B_n : X \rightarrow l_\infty^{2^n}$  and  $\sup_n \|A_n\| \|B_n\| \leq 1 + \theta$  ( $\theta > 0$ ). It turns out that the image-martingale  $\{M_k\}_0^n \subset L_2^X$  of  $\{M_k^1\}$  ( $n$  is fixed,  $\{M_k^1\}$  is defined in the previous section), which is given by  $M_k(\omega) := A_n M_k^1(\omega)$  ( $k = 1, \dots, n$ ), possesses a large random unconditional constant. To see this we set

$$M_k^\infty(\omega) := \sigma_n M_k^1(\omega) \quad (\omega \in \Omega_n, k = 0, \dots, n)$$

and obtain a martingale  $\{M_k^\infty\}_0^n$  with values in  $l_\infty^{2^n}$ . For  $k = 1, \dots, n$  it is easy to check that

$$dM_k^\infty(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k) = \omega_k 2^{k-n-1} (0, \dots, 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, 2^{n-k}, 2^{n-k} - 1, \dots, 3, 2, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$$

where the block  $(1, 2, 3, \dots, 2^{n-k})$  is concentrated on  $I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, 1)$  and the block  $(2^{n-k} - 1, \dots, 3, 2, 1, 0)$  is concentrated on  $I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}, -1)$ , that is, the vectors  $|dM_k^\infty(\omega)|$  correspond to a discrete Schauder system in  $l_\infty^{2^n}$ . Furthermore, we have

**Lemma 4.1** *Let  $n \geq 2$  be a natural number and let  $\{e_i\}$  be the standard basis of  $l_1^{2^n}$ . Then there exists a map  $e : \{-1, 1\}^n \longrightarrow \{e_1, \dots, e_{2^n}\} \subset l_1^{2^n}$  such that*

$$\mu_n \left\{ \omega : |\langle dM_k^\infty(\omega), e(\omega) \rangle| \geq \frac{1}{4} \right\} \geq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for} \quad k = 1, \dots, n.$$

*Proof.* First we observe that

$$\inf \{ |\langle dM_k^\infty(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k), e_i \rangle| : i \in I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k, -\omega_k) \} = 2^{k-n-1} \min(2^{n-k-1} + 1, 2^{n-k} - 2^{n-k-1}) \geq \frac{1}{4}$$

for  $1 \leq k < n$ . Then we use the fact that

$$\#(\cap_1^n \text{supp } dM_k^\infty(\omega)) = 1 \quad \text{for all} \quad \omega \in \{-1, 1\}^n$$

to define  $e(\omega)$  as the  $i$ -th unit vector, in the case if

$$\{i\} = \cap_1^n \text{supp } dM_k^\infty(\omega) \subseteq \cap_2^n I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k-1}).$$

For  $1 \leq k \leq n - 2$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_n \left\{ \omega : |\langle dM_k^\infty(\omega), e(\omega) \rangle| \geq \frac{1}{4} \right\} \\ & \geq \mu_n \left\{ (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) : |\langle dM_k^\infty(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k), e(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) \rangle| \geq \frac{1}{4}, \quad \omega_{k+1} = -\omega_k \right\} \\ & \geq \mu_n \left\{ (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) : \inf \{ |\langle dM_k^\infty(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k), e_i \rangle| : i \in I(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{k+1}) \} \geq \frac{1}{4}, \quad \omega_{k+1} = -\omega_k \right\} \\ & = \mu_n \{ \omega_{k+1} = -\omega_k \} = \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|\langle dM_k^\infty(\omega), e(\omega) \rangle| \geq \frac{1}{4}$  for all  $\omega$  in the cases  $k = n - 1$  and  $k = n$  the proof is complete.  $\square$

We deduce

**Lemma 4.2** *Let  $n \geq 1$  be fixed. Then*

- (1)  $\|M_k^\infty(\omega)\| = 1$  and  $\|dM_l^\infty(\omega)\| = \frac{1}{2}$  for  $k = 0, \dots, n$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, n$ , and all  $\omega \in \Omega_n$ ,  
(2)  $\mu_n \left\{ \omega : \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k^\infty(\omega) \right\| \geq \alpha n^{1/2} \right\} > \beta$  for some  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  independent from  $n$ .

*Remark.* An inequality  $\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k^\infty(\omega) \right\| \geq \alpha n^{1/2}$  can not hold for all  $\omega \in \Omega_n$  since, for example,

$$\left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k^\infty(1, 1, \dots, 1) \right\| \leq \left\| \sum_1^n dM_k^\infty(1, 1, \dots, 1) \right\| \leq \|\sigma_n\| \left\| \sum_1^n dM_k^1(1, 1, \dots, 1) \right\| \leq 2$$

*Proof* of Lemma 4.2. Assertion (1) is trivial. We prove (2). For  $t > 0$  we consider

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n \left\{ \omega : \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k^\infty(\omega) \right\|_{l_\infty^{2n}} > tn^{1/2} \right\} &\geq \mu_n \left\{ \omega : \|\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon\| \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k^\infty(\omega) \right\|_{l_\infty^{2n}} > tn^{1/2} \right\} \\ &\geq \mu_n \left\{ \omega : \frac{1}{c_o} \left\| \left( \sum_1^n |dM_k^\infty(\omega)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{l_\infty^{2n}} > tn^{1/2} \right\} \\ &= \mu_n \left\{ \omega : \left\| \sum_1^n |dM_k^\infty(\omega)|^2 \right\|_{l_\infty^{2n}} > c_o^2 t^2 n \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting the last mentioned expression by  $p_t$  the previous lemma yields

$$\begin{aligned} p_t n + (1 - p_t) c_o^2 t^2 n &\geq \mathbb{E}_\omega \left\| \sum_1^n |dM_k^\infty(\omega)|^2 \right\| \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_\omega < \sum_1^n |dM_k^\infty(\omega)|^2, e(\omega) > \\ &= \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_1^n |< dM_k^\infty(\omega), e(\omega) >|^2 \\ &\geq \sum_1^n \frac{1}{16} \mu \left\{ \omega : |< dM_k^\infty(\omega), e(\omega) >|^2 \geq \frac{1}{16} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{n}{32} \end{aligned}$$

such that  $p_t \geq \frac{1/32 - c_o^2 t^2}{1 - c_o^2 t^2}$  for  $c_o^2 t^2 < 1$ .  $\square$

Lemmas 3.2 and 4.2 imply

**Theorem 4.3** *There are  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  such that for all non-superreflexive Banach spaces  $X$ , for all  $\theta > 0$ , and for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  there exists a Walsh-Paley martingale  $\{M_k\}_0^n$  with values in  $B_X$ ,*

$$\inf_{1 \leq k \leq n} \inf_\omega \|dM_k(\omega)\| \geq \frac{1}{2(1 + \theta)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_n \left\{ \omega : \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k(\omega) \right\| \geq \alpha n^{1/2} \right\} > \beta.$$

*Proof.* We choose factorizations  $\sigma_n = B_n A_n$  with  $A_n : l_1^{2^n} \rightarrow X$ ,  $B_n : X \rightarrow l_\infty^{2^n}$ ,  $\|A_n\| \leq 1$  and  $\|B_n\| \leq 1 + \min(1, \theta)$  (see [7](Thm.4)). Defining  $M_k(\omega) := A_n M_k^1(\omega) \in X$  we obtain  $\sup_{0 \leq k \leq n, \omega \in \Omega_n} \|M_k(\omega)\| \leq 1$  from Lemma 3.3 as well as  $\inf_{1 \leq k \leq n, \omega \in \Omega_n} \|dM_k(\omega)\| \geq \frac{1}{2(1+\theta)}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n \left\{ \omega : \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k(\omega) \right\|_X > \frac{\alpha}{2} n^{1/2} \right\} &\geq \mu_n \left\{ \omega : \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k(\omega) \right\|_X > \frac{\alpha}{\|B_n\|} n^{1/2} \right\} \\ &\geq \mu_n \left\{ \omega : \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k^\infty(\omega) \right\|_{l_\infty^{2^n}} > \alpha n^{1/2} \right\} \geq \beta \end{aligned}$$

according to Lemma 4.2.  $\square$

For Banach spaces of type 2 we get

**Theorem 4.4** *For any Banach space  $X$  of type 2 the following assertions are equivalent.*

- (1)  $X$  is not superreflexive.
- (2)  $\frac{1}{c} n^{1/2} \leq RUMD_n(X) \leq c n^{1/2}$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and some  $c > 0$ .
- (3)  $\frac{1}{c'} n^{1/2} \leq RUMD_n(X)$  for  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and some  $c' > 0$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) follows from Theorem 4.3 and Lemma 3.4. (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). We assume  $X$  to be superreflexive and find ([8], cf.[14](Thm1.2, Prop.1.2))  $\gamma > 0$  and  $2 \leq s < \infty$  such that

$$\left( \sum_{k \geq 0} \|dM_k\|_{L_2^X}^s \right)^{1/s} \leq \gamma \sup_k \|M_k\|_{L_2^X}$$

for all martingales in  $X$ . This martingale cotype implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon, \omega} \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k(\omega) \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} &\leq T_2(X) \left( \mathbb{E}_\omega \sum_1^n \|dM_k(\omega)\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq T_2(X) n^{1/2-1/s} \gamma \|M_n - M_0\|_{L_2^X} \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts  $RUMD_n(X) \geq \frac{1}{c'} n^{1/2}$ .  $\square$

*Remark.* Corollary 5.4 will demonstrate that the asymptotic behaviour of  $RUMD_n(X)$  can not characterize the superreflexivity of  $X$  in the case that  $X$  is of type  $p$  with  $p < 2$ . Namely, according to Theorem 5.4 for all  $1 < p < 2 < q < \infty$  there is a superreflexive Banach space  $X$  of type  $p$  and of cotype  $q$  with  $RUMD_n(X) \asymp n^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}}$ . On the other hand, if  $\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q} \geq \frac{1}{2}$  then we can find a non-superreflexive Banach space  $Y$  such that  $RUMD_n(Y) \asymp n^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}}$  (add a non-superreflexive Banach space of type 2 to  $X$ ).

Finally, we deduce the random unconditional constants of the summation operators  $\sigma_n$ ,  $\sigma$ , and  $\Phi$  defined in the beginning of this section. To this end we need the type 2 property of these operators. From [7] and [9] or [16] as well as [18] we know the much stronger results, that  $\sigma$  and the usual summation

operator from  $L_1[0, 1]$  into  $L_\infty[0, 1]$  can be factorized through a type 2 space. We want to present a very simple argument for the type 2 property of the operator  $\Phi$  which can be extended to some other "integral operators" from  $C[0, 1]'$  into  $l_\infty([0, 1])$ .

**Lemma 4.5** *The operator  $\Phi : C[0, 1]' \rightarrow l_\infty([0, 1])$  is of type 2 with  $T_2(\Phi) \leq 2$ .*

*Proof.* First we deduce the type 2 inequality for Dirac-measures. Let  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{K}$ ,  $t_1, \dots, t_n \in [0, 1]$ , whereas we assume  $0 \leq t_{k_1} = \dots = t_{l_1} < t_{k_2} = \dots = t_{l_2} < \dots < t_{k_M} = \dots = t_{l_M} \leq 1$ , and let  $\delta_{t_1}, \dots, \delta_{t_n}$  the corresponding Dirac-measures. Then, using Doob's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_1^n \Phi \varepsilon_j \lambda_j \delta_{t_j} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} &= \left( \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \sup_t \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \left( \sum_{k_i}^{l_i} \varepsilon_j \lambda_j \right) \delta_{t_{k_j}}([0, t]) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left( \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \sup_{1 \leq m \leq M} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \sum_{k_i}^{l_i} \varepsilon_j \lambda_j \right) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2 \left( \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \left( \sum_{k_i}^{l_i} \varepsilon_j \lambda_j \right) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= 2 \left( \sum_1^n |\lambda_j|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\left( \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_1^n \Phi \varepsilon_j \lambda_j \delta_{t_j} \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 2 \left( \sum_1^n \|\lambda_j \delta_{t_j}\|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

In the next step for any  $\mu \in C[0, 1]'$  we find a sequence of point measures (finite sums of Dirac-measures)  $\{\mu^m\}_{m=1}^\infty \subset C[0, 1]'$  such that  $\sup_m \|\mu^m\| \leq \|\mu\|$  and  $\lim_m \mu^m([0, t]) = \mu([0, t])$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  (take, for example,  $\mu^m := \sum_{i=1}^{2^m} \delta_{\frac{i-1}{2^m}} \mu(I_i^m)$  with  $I_1^m := [0, \frac{1}{2^m}]$  and  $I_i^m := (\frac{i-1}{2^m}, \frac{i}{2^m}]$  for  $i > 1$ ). Now, assuming  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n \in C[0, 1]'$  we choose for each  $\mu_j$  a sequence  $\{\mu_j^m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  of point measures in the above way and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_1^n \Phi \varepsilon_j \mu_j \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} &= \left( \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \sup_t \left| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_j \mu_j([0, t]) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left( \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \sup_t \lim_m \left| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_j \mu_j^m([0, t]) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \limsup_m \left( \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \sup_t \left| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_j \mu_j^m([0, t]) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the type 2 inequality for Dirac measures and an extreme point argument we may continue to

$$\left( \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_1^n \Phi \varepsilon_j \mu_j \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 2 \limsup_m \left( \sum_1^n \|\mu_j^m\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq 2 \left( \sum_1^n \|\mu_j\|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \square$$

As a consequence we obtain

**Theorem 4.6** *There is an absolute constant  $c > 0$  such that for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$*

$$\frac{1}{c}n^{1/2} \leq RUMD_n(\sigma_n) \leq RUMD_n(\sigma) \leq RUMD_n(\Phi) \leq cn^{1/2}.$$

*Proof.*  $\frac{1}{c}n^{1/2} \leq RUMD_n(\sigma_n)$  is a consequence of Lemma 3.3 and 4.2.  $RUMD_n(\sigma_n) \leq RUMD_n(\sigma) \leq RUMD_n(\Phi)$  is trivial. Finally, Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 3.4 imply  $RUMD_n(\Phi) \leq 4n^{1/2}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.7** *There is an absolute constant  $c > 0$  such that for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$*

$$\frac{1}{c}n^{1/2} \leq \left( \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon, \omega} \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k dM_k^\infty(\omega) \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} = \left( \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon, \omega} \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k |dM_k^\infty(\omega)| \right\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq cn^{1/2}.$$

*Proof.* This immediately follows from Lemma 4.2, Theorem 4.6, and  $dM_k^\infty(\omega) = \omega_k |dM_k^\infty(\omega)|$ .  $\square$

## 5 An example

We consider an example of Bourgain to demonstrate that for all  $0 \leq \alpha < 1$  there is a superreflexive Banach space  $X$  with  $RUMD_n(X) \asymp n^\alpha$ . Moreover, the general principle of this construction allows us to show that  $RUMD_n^1(\mathbb{K}) \asymp n$  mentioned in section 2 of this paper.

The definitions concerning upper  $p$ - and lower- $q$  estimates of a Banach space as well as the modulus of convexity and smoothness, which we will use here, can be found in [10].

Let us start with a Banach space  $X$  and let us consider the function space  $X_{\Omega_n} := \{f : \Omega_n \rightarrow X\}$  equipped with some norm  $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_{X_{\Omega_n}}$ . For a fixed  $f \in X_{\Omega_n}$  we define

$$M^f : \Omega_n \rightarrow X_{\Omega_n} \quad \text{by} \quad M^f(\omega) := f_\omega$$

where  $f_\omega(\omega') := f(\omega\omega')$  ( $\omega\omega' := (\omega_1\omega'_1, \dots, \omega_n\omega'_n)$  for  $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n)$  and  $\omega' = (\omega'_1, \dots, \omega'_n)$ ). Setting  $M_k^f := \mathbb{E}(M_n^f | \mathcal{F}_k)$  we obtain a martingale  $\{M_k^f\}_{k=0}^n$  with values in  $X_{\Omega_n}$  generated by the function  $f \in X_{\Omega_n}$ . Furthermore, putting  $f_n := f$ ,

$$f_k(\omega) := \mathbb{E}(f | \mathcal{F}_k)(\omega) = \frac{1}{2^{n-k}} \sum_{\omega'_{k+1}=\pm 1} \dots \sum_{\omega'_n=\pm 1} f_n(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_k, \omega'_{k+1}, \dots, \omega'_n),$$

$df_k := f_k - f_{k-1}$  for  $k \geq 1$ , and  $df_0 = f_0$ , it yields

$$\left( \sum_0^n \alpha_k df_k \right)_\omega = \sum_0^n \alpha_k dM_k^f(\omega) \quad \text{for all } \omega \in \Omega_n \quad \text{and all } \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{K}.$$

The following lemma is now evident.

**Lemma 5.1** *Let  $f \in X_{\Omega_n}$  and let  $\{M_k^f\}_0^n$  be the corresponding martingale. If  $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_{X_{\Omega_n}}$  is translation invariant then  $\|\sum_0^n \alpha_k dM_k^f(\omega)\| = \|\sum_0^n \alpha_k df_k\|$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega_n$  and all  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{K}$ .*

First we deduce

**Corollary 5.2** *There exists  $c > 0$  such that  $\frac{n}{c} \leq RUMD_n^1(\mathbb{K}) \leq RUMD_n^1(X) \leq cn$  for all  $n = 1, 2, \dots$  and all Banach spaces  $X$ .*

*Proof.* We consider  $\mathbb{K}_{\Omega_n}$  with  $\|f\| := \sum_{\omega} |f(\omega)|$  such that  $\mathbb{K}_{\Omega_n} = l_1(\Omega_n)$ . Defining  $f \in l_1(\Omega_n)$  as  $f := \chi_{\{(1, \dots, 1)\}}$  it follows that  $f_{\omega} = \chi_{\{\omega\}}$ . It is clear that the isometry  $I : l_1(\Omega_n) \rightarrow l_1^{2n}$  with  $If_{\omega} := e_{i(\omega)}$  ( $e_{i(\omega)}$  is the  $i(\omega)$ -th unit vector where  $i(\omega)$  is defined as in section 3 of this paper) transforms the martingale  $\{M_k^f\}$  into the martingale  $\{M_k^1\}$  from section 3 by  $IM_k^f(\omega) = M_k^1(\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega_n$ . Combining Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 3.3 yields

$$\inf_{\omega} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_k df_k \right\|_{l_1(\Omega_n)} \geq \alpha n \quad \text{and} \quad \|f - f_0\|_{l_1(\Omega_n)} \leq 2.$$

Consequently,  $RUMD_n^1(X) \geq RUMD_n^1(\mathbb{K}) \geq \frac{\alpha}{2}n$ . On the other hand we have  $RUMD_n^1(X) \leq 2n$  in general.  $\square$

Now, we treat Bourgain's example [2] .

**Theorem 5.3** *For all  $1 < p < q < \infty$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a function lattice  $X_{pq}^{2n} = \mathbb{K}_{\Omega_{2n}}$  such that*  
(1)  $X_{pq}^{2n}$  has an upper  $p$ - and a lower  $q$ -estimate with the constant 1,  
(2) there exists a Walsh-Paley martingale  $\{M_k\}_0^{2n}$  with values in  $B_{X_{pq}^{2n}}$  and

$$\inf_{\omega} \mathbb{E}_{\varepsilon} \left\| \sum_1^{2n} \varepsilon_k dM_k(\omega) \right\| \geq c(2n)^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}}$$

where  $c > 0$  is an absolute constant independent from  $p, q$ , and  $n$ .

*Proof.* In [2] (Lemma 3) it is shown that there is a lattice norm  $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{K}_{\Omega_{2n}}}$  on  $\mathbb{K}_{\Omega_{2n}}$  which satisfies (1), such that there exists a function  $\phi \in \mathbb{K}_{\Omega_{2n}}$  with

$$\|\phi\| \leq \varepsilon^{1 - \frac{p}{q}} \quad (\varepsilon = 2n^{-\frac{1}{p}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \left( \sum_0^{2n} |d\phi_k|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

[2] (Lemma 4 and remarks below,  $\varepsilon = 2n^{-1/p}$  is taken from the proof of Lemma 4). Since  $\|\cdot\|$  is translation invariant Lemma 5.1 implies

$$\|M_k^{\phi}(\omega)\| = \|M_k^{\phi}\|_{L_2^{X_{pq}^{2n}}} \leq \|M_n^{\phi}\|_{L_2^{X_{pq}^{2n}}} = \|\phi\| \leq 4(2n)^{\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p}}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_0^{2n} \varepsilon_k dM_k^\phi(\omega) \right\| = \mathbb{E}_\varepsilon \left\| \sum_0^{2n} \varepsilon_k d\phi_k \right\| \geq \|\mathbb{E}_\varepsilon\| \sum_0^{2n} \varepsilon_k d\phi_k \parallel \geq \frac{1}{A} \left\| \left( \sum_0^{2n} |d\phi_k|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\| \geq \frac{1}{2A}. \square$$

As usual, in the following the phrase "the modulus of convexity (smoothness) of  $X$  is of power type  $r$ " stands for "there is some equivalent norm on  $X$  with the modulus of convexity (smoothness) of power type  $r$ ". Now, similarly to [2] we apply a standard procedure to the above finite-dimensional result.

**Corollary 5.4** (1) *For all  $1 < p < 2 < q < \infty$  there is a Banach space  $X$  with the modulus of convexity of power type  $q$  and the modulus of smoothness of power type  $p$ , and a constant  $c > 0$  such that*

$$\frac{1}{c} n^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}} \leq RUMD_n(X) \leq c n^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{q}} \quad \text{for } n = 1, 2, \dots$$

(2) *There is a Banach space  $X$  with the modulus of convexity of power type  $q$  and the modulus of smoothness of power type  $p$  for all  $1 < p < 2 < q < \infty$ , and  $RUMD_n(X) \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$ .*

*Proof.* For sequences  $P = \{p_n\}$  and  $Q = \{q_n\}$  with

$$1 < p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots \leq p_n \leq \dots < 2 < \dots \leq q_n \leq \dots \leq q_2 \leq q_1 < \infty$$

we set  $X_{PQ} := \bigoplus_2 X_{p_n q_n}^{2n}$  and obtain that  $X_{PQ}$  satisfies an upper  $p_k$ - and a lower  $q_k$ -estimate for all  $k$ . According to a result of Figiel and Johnson (cf. [10] (II.1.f.10))  $X_{PQ}$  has the modulus of convexity of power type  $q_k$  and the modulus of smoothness of power type  $p_k$  for all  $k = 1, 2, \dots$ . Furthermore, [14](Theorem 2.2) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\varepsilon_1 \pm 1, \dots, \varepsilon_n \pm 1} \left\| \sum_1^n \varepsilon_l dM_l \right\|_{L_2^X} &\leq c_{p_k} \left( \sum_1^n \|dM_l\|_{L_2^X}^{p_k} \right)^{1/p_k} \\ &\leq c_{p_k} n^{\frac{1}{p_k} - \frac{1}{q_k}} \left( \sum_1^n \|dM_l\|_{L_2^X}^{q_k} \right)^{1/q_k} \\ &\leq c_{p_k} d_{q_k} n^{\frac{1}{p_k} - \frac{1}{q_k}} \left\| \sum_1^n dM_l \right\|_{L_2^X} \end{aligned}$$

for all martingales  $\{M_l\}$  with values in  $X_{PQ}$  such that  $RUMD_n(X_{PQ}) \leq c_{p_k} d_{q_k} n^{\frac{1}{p_k} - \frac{1}{q_k}}$ . On the other hand, from Theorem 5.3 we obtain

$$c(2n)^{\frac{1}{p_n} - \frac{1}{q_n}} \leq RUMD_{2n}(X_{p_n q_n}^{2n}) \leq RUMD_{2n}(X_{PQ}).$$

Now, setting  $p_k \equiv p$  and  $q_k \equiv q$  we obtain (1). Choosing the sequences in the way that  $p_k \rightarrow_{k \rightarrow \infty} 2$ ,  $q_k \rightarrow_{k \rightarrow \infty} 2$ , and  $n^{\frac{1}{p_n} - \frac{1}{q_n}} \rightarrow_{n \rightarrow \infty} \infty$  assertion (2) follows.  $\square$

## References

- [1] D.J.Aldous , Unconditional bases and martingales in  $L_p(F)$ , Math.Proc.Camb.Phil.Soc.85(1979), 117-123.
- [2] J.Bourgain , Some remarks on Banach spaces in which martingale difference sequences are unconditional, Ark.Mat. 21(1983), 163-168.
- [3] D.L.Burkholder , Martingales and Fourier analysis in Banach spaces, Probability and analysis (Varena, 1985),LNM 1206(1986), 61-108.
- [4] J.Elton , Sign-embeddings on  $l_1^n$ , Trans.Amer.Math.Soc.279(1983), 113-124.
- [5] D.J.H.Garling , Random martingale transform inequalities, Probability in Banach spaces 6. Proceedings of the Sixth international conference, Sandbjerg, Denmark 1986, Birkhaeuser 1990.
- [6] S.Geiss , Antisymmetric tensor products of absolutely p-summing operators, to appear in J.Appr.Th.
- [7] R.C.James , Super-reflexive Banach spaces, Can.J.Math. 5(1972), 896-904.
- [8] R.C.James , Super-reflexive spaces with bases, Pacific J.Math.41(1972), 409-419.
- [9] R.C.James , Non-reflexive spaces of type 2, Isr.J.Math. 30(1978), 1-13.
- [10] J.Lindenstrauss and L.Tzafriri , Classical Banach spaces I/II, Springer,New York-Berlin-Heidelberg 1977/79.
- [11] B.Maurey , Systeme de Haar. Sem. Maurey-Schwartz 1974-1975, Ecole Polytechnique, Paris.
- [12] B.Maurey and G.Pisier , Series de variables aleatoires vectorielles independantes et proprietes geometriques des espaces de Banach, Stud. Math. 58(1976), 45-90.
- [13] A.Pajor , Prolongement de  $l_1^n$  dans les espaces de Banach complexes, C.R.Acad.Sci.Paris Ser. I Math. 296(1983), 741-743.
- [14] G.Pisier , Martingales with values in uniformly convex spaces, Isr.J.Math. 20(1975), 326-350.
- [15] G.Pisier , Un exemple concernant la super-reflexivite, Sem. Maurey-Schwartz 1974-1975, Ecole Polytechnique, Paris.
- [16] G.Pisier,Q.Xu , Random series in the real interpolation spaces between the spaces  $v_p$ , Geometrical aspects of functional analysis (1985/86), LNM 1267(1987), 185-209.
- [17] N.Tomczak-Jaegermann , Banach-Mazur distances and finite dimensional operator ideals, Pitman 1988.
- [18] Q.Xu , Espaces d'interpolation reels entre les espaces  $V_p$ : Proprietes geometriques et applications probabilistes, Theses, Universite Paris 6, 1988.